UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,588	10/09/2003	Gulcin H. Sengir	8540R-000066 (GP-303794)	9765

7590 12/11/2006

General Motors Corporation - Legal Staff
Kathryn A. Marra
Mail Code 482-C23-B21
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, MI 48265-3000

EXAMINER	
LOFTIS, JOHNNA RONEE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3623	

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/682,588	**Applicant(s)** SENGIR ET AL.
	Examiner Johnna R. Loftis	**Art Unit** 3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-5,7-16,18-21 and 23-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *32-41* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-5,7,9,12-16,18-21,23,25,28,30,31,42 and 43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *8, 10, 11, 13, 24, 26, 27, 29* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a first office action upon examination of application number. Applicant has elected Group II, claims 2-5, 7-16, 18-21, 23-31, 42 and 43 which are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 5/17/06 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates that the list is an information disclosure statement. The information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by The Advisory Board Company's Chapter 4 – Managing Core Competencies of the Corporation, Tactic #17 Organizational Network Mapping, hereinafter referred to as Tactic #17.

As per **claim 42**, Tactic #17 teaches inputting data relative to the collaborative relationship into a computer model, wherein said data relates to joint work, communication, interaction and social structure of the collaborative relationship (p 395 – computer generates graphical and quantitative representations of knowledge networks within an organization; p 396 involves taking a look personal contacts through which work gets done); analyzing said data with said model by using at least one method of analysis selected from the group consisting of statistical analysis, egocentric network analysis, sociometric analysis, network visualization analysis and combinations thereof (p 395 – computer generates graphical and quantitative representations of knowledge networks within an organization), wherein said model comprises components including level of joint work, level of communication, quality of interaction, and connectivity of social structure of relationship (p 397-399 the organization chart that is generated comprises connections between individuals thereby revealing how individuals work together, communicate, interact and the links show the social structure of the organization), wherein said level of joint work comprises a joint work importance component and a joint work frequency component (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction and during assessment information is collected regarding with whom individuals discuss what is important and valued in the organization (see surveyed employee chart, bottom p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information) and said model tracks interrelationships between said components, wherein said analyzing computes a weighted value for each of said respective components, and wherein said model generates an output value (p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information; p 400 model shows interrelationships between individuals) and determining a condition of the collaborative relationship that is related to said output value generated by said model (p 400 – generated visual summary indicates quality and number of linkages between people in collaborative network spotlighting people who generate critical insights; p 401 quantitative assessments are also generated showing how individuals collaborate).

As per **claim 2**, Tactic #17 teaches the model tracks at least one of said components as a function of time (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction – inherently frequency of the interaction includes a time component).

As per **claim 3**, Tactic #17 teaches the model tracks each of the components as a function of time (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction – inherently frequency of the interaction includes a time component).

As per **claim 4**, Tactic #17 teaches time relates to a stage of a life cycle of the collaborative relationship (p 398 – shows example of determining collaboration patterns during product development and rollout, including each stage of the process).

As per **claim 5**, Tactic #17 teaches at least some of said data includes a time identifier (399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction – inherently a time is tracked in order to generate frequency data).

As per **claim 7**, Tactic #17 teaches the level of communication component comprises a communication frequency component and a communication importance component (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction and during assessment information is collected regarding with whom individuals discuss what is important and valued in the organization (see surveyed employee chart, bottom p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information).

As per **claim 9**, Tactic #17 teaches the connectivity of social structure component comprises a first subgroup related to a structure of the collaborative relationship (p 401 – interactions are assessed quantitatively including how active a person is and how much control the person has over the flow of information) and a second subgroup of related to role dynamics of the collaborative relationship (p 401 – interactions are assessed quantitatively including reach – how much potential influence a person wields).

As per **claim 12**, Tactic #17 teaches at least one of the components employs system dynamics (p 396 – the generated organization charts prescribe that work and information flow in a hierarchy).

As per **claim 14**, Tactic #17 teaches each of said components is assigned a relative weighted value with respect to a total value for all said components, wherein said total value relates to said output value (p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information; p 400 model shows interrelationships between individuals).

As per **claim 15**, Tactic #17 teaches determining further comprises comparing said out put value to a baseline value that is also generated by said model (p 402 - initial network map showed interactions organized in five work groups, however, p 403 – analysis reveals the organization actually functions through three communities of knowledge).

As per **claim 16**, Tactic #17 teaches validating an accuracy of said model by comparing said output value to an exemplary value representing an exemplary collaborative relationship generated by said model (p 402 - initial network map showed interactions organized in five work groups, however, p 403 – analysis reveals the organization actually functions through three communities of knowledge)

As per **claim 43**, Tactic #17 teaches inputting data relative to the collaborative relationship into a computer model, wherein said data relates to joint work, communication, interaction and social structure of the collaborative relationship (p 395 – computer generates graphical and quantitative representations of knowledge networks within an organization; p 396 involves taking a look personal contacts through which work gets done); determining an ouput value of the collaborative relationship by analyzing said data with said model by using at least one method of analysis selected from the group consisting of statistical analysis, egocentric network analysis, sociometric analysis, network visualization analysis and combinations thereof (p 395 – computer generates graphical and quantitative representations of knowledge networks within an organization), wherein said model comprises components including level of joint work, level of communication, quality of interaction, and connectivity of social structure of relationship (p 397-399 the organization chart that is generated comprises connections between individuals thereby revealing how individuals work together, communicate, interact and the links show the social structure of the organization), wherein said level of joint work comprises a joint work importance component and a joint work frequency component (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction and during assessment information is collected regarding with whom individuals discuss what is important and valued in the organization (see surveyed employee chart, bottom p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information) and said model tracks interrelationships between said components and at least a portion of said components as a function of time (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction – inherently frequency of the interaction includes a time component), wherein said analyzing computes a weighted value for each of said respective components(p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information; p 400 model shows interrelationships between individuals); and determining a condition of the collaborative relationship that is related to said output value generated by said model (p 400 – generated visual summary indicates quality and number of linkages between people in collaborative network spotlighting people who generate critical insights; p 401 quantitative assessments are also generated showing how individuals collaborate).

As per **claim 18**, Tactic #17 teaches the model tracks each of the components as a function of time (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction – inherently frequency of the interaction includes a time component).

As per **claim 19**, Tactic #17 teaches time relates to a stage of a life cycle of the collaborative relationship (p 398 – shows example of determining collaboration patterns during product development and rollout, including each stage of the process).

As per **claim 20**, Tactic #17 teaches at least some of said data includes a time identifier (399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction – inherently a time is tracked in order to generate frequency data).

As per **claim 21**, Tactic #17 teaches time relates to a stage of a life cycle of the collaborative relationship (p 398 – shows example of determining collaboration patterns during product development and rollout, including each stage of the process, key players are identified through the organizational mapping p 399-402).

As per **claim 23,** Tactic #17 teaches the level of communication component comprises a communication frequency component and a communication importance component (p 399 data is gathered regarding collaboration patterns including frequency of interaction and during assessment information is collected regarding with whom individuals discuss what is important and valued in the organization (see surveyed employee chart, bottom p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information).

As per **claim 25**, Tactic #17 teaches the connectivity of social structure component comprises a first subgroup related to a structure of the collaborative relationship (p 401 – interactions are assessed quantitatively including how active a person is and how much control the person has over the flow of information) and a second subgroup of related to role dynamics of the collaborative relationship (p 401 – interactions are assessed quantitatively including reach – how much potential influence a person wields).

As per **claim 28**, Tactic #17 teaches at least one of the components employs system dynamics (p 396 – the generated organization charts prescribe that work and information flow in a hierarchy).

As per **claim 30**, Tactic #17 teaches each of said components is assigned a relative weighted value with respect to a total value for all said components, wherein said total value relates to said output value (p 399 – employees are scored based (importance) on how often an individual discusses information; p 400 model shows interrelationships between individuals).

As per **claim 31**, Tactic #17 teaches validating an accuracy of said model by comparing said output value to an exemplary value representing an exemplary collaborative relationship generated by said model (p 402 - initial network map showed interactions organized in five work groups, however, p 403 – analysis reveals the organization actually functions through three communities of knowledge)

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/8/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant traverses prior restriction requirement. Examiner notes that while the two groups of claims share the same classification, the claims are directed to different subject matter and would require a different field of search. Restriction requirement is upheld.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 8, 10, 11, 13, 24, 26, 27, and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Smith et al, US 6,594,673 – visualizations for collaborative information

Jordan et al, Us 5,745,113 – representing work practices

Morelli, Mark D.; Eppinger, Steven D.; Gulati, Rosaline K. Predicting Technical Communicaiton in Product Development Organizations

Garton, Laura; Haythornwaite, Caroline; Wellman, Barry. Studying On-Line Social Networks

Puittinen, Rainer; Hameri, Ari-Pekka. Measuring and visualizing information transfer in networked collaboration.

Benson, Peter Jackson, PhD. A Field Study of Communication Patterns in an Organization using the Negopy Computerized Network Analysis Technique

McCord, Kent R.; Eppinger, Steven D. Managing the Integration Problem in Concurrent Engineering

Allen, Thomas. Architecture and Communication Among Product Development Engineers

An Introduction to Social Network Analysis from www.orgnet.com/sna.html

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R. Loftis whose telephone number is 571-272-6736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JL
12/4/06

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600